

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

GALVESTON DIVISION

CHAND WIJE	§	
	§	
VS.	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. G-04-464
	§	
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS MEDICAL	§	
BRANCH AT GALVESTON, ET AL.	§	

OPINION AND ORDER

Before the Court are two Reports from the United States Magistrate Judge; each Report recommends partial dismissal of claims asserted by Plaintiff, Chand Wije. Wije has filed timely objections to the Reports

Upon *de novo* review, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court finds that the Reports are well reasoned and correctly apply the law to the facts in this case. Accordingly, the Reports (Instrument nos. 82 and 83) are **ACCEPTED** by this Court in their entirety and incorporated by reference herein.

It is, therefore, **ORDERED** that the Defendants “ Motion for Judgment” (Instrument no. 71) is **GRANTED** and Wije’ s Texas Commission on Human Rights (TCHR) claims against the University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston (UTMB) and against Defendants Benham, Howell and Hodskins in their official capacities are **DISMISSED**.

It is further **ORDERED** that the Defendants “ Motion for Judgment” (Instrument no. 71) is **GRANTED** and Wije’ s claim under TCHR against Benham, Howell and Hodskins in their individual capacities is **DISMISSED**.


It is further **ORDERED** that the Defendants “ Motion for Judgment” (Instrument no. 71) is **GRANTED** and Wije’ s 42 U.S.C. § 1981 claims against UTMB and against Benham, Howell and Hodskins in their official capacities is **DISMISSED**.

It is further **ORDERED** that the Defendants “ Motion for Judgment” (Instrument no. 71) is **GRANTED** and Wije’ s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claims against UTMB and against Benham, Howell and Hodskins in their official capacities is **DISMISSED**.

It is further **ORDERED** that the Defendants “ Motion for Judgment” (Instrument no. 71) is **DENIED** as to Wije’ s claims brought under the Equal Pay Act (EPA) against the individual Defendants.

It is further **ORDERED** that the UTMB’ s “ Amended Motion to Dismiss” (Instrument no. 74) is **GRANTED** and Wije’ s conspiracy claim against Benham, Howell and Hodskins in their individual capacities is **DISMISSED**.

DONE at Galveston, Texas, this 20th day of April, 2006.



Samuel B. Kent
United States District Judge